



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/985,973

11/07/2001

Alyssa Dver

1113-202

4629

30011 7590 01/26/2007  
LIEBERMAN & BRANDSDORFER, LLC  
802 STILL CREEK LANE  
GAITHERSBURG, MD 20878

EXAMINER

VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

01/26/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/985,973

Applicant(s)

DVER ET AL.

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to communications received 11/09/2006. Claims 1, 5, 23, 42, and 51 have been amended. Claims 1-56 are pending.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendment to claim 5 is sufficient to overcome the claim objections set forth in the previous office action.
3. Applicant's amendment to claim 1 is sufficient to overcome the 35 USC § 112, second paragraphs, rejections set forth in the previous office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 52 recites "modulated carrier signal". This claim was added in the preliminary amendment filed 09/24/2003, and thus was not part of the originally presented disclosure. Examiner is unable to find support for this limitation, that the medium is a modulated carrier signal. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that "modulated carrier signal" was not described

Art Unit: 3623

in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of this claimed feature.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 3-5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3-5 and 16 recite the limitation "wherein the step of customizing a workflow parameter for said record". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation claim 1 as this language was deleted from step (b) in the current amendments. Clarification is required. For examination purposes, examiner has construed this limitation as wherein parameters for said workflow.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 12-13, 19-20, 23-27, 32, 38-39, 42-43, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waits et al. (U.S. 5,721,831).

As per claim 1, Waits et al. teaches a method for marketing comprising:

Art Unit: 3623

(a) creating a record in a database (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, line 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database);

(b) entering the record into a workflow having at least two stations, wherein each station represents a marketing opportunity (See column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein stations/positions include segments, active campaigns, and active campaign tracking);

(c) assigning an initial station for said record being entered into said workflow, wherein the step of assigning an initial station is based upon an identified source of said record to said workflow and parameters of said stations in said workflow (See column 3, lines 20-41, wherein the initial station/position is assignment to a segment, wherein the segment is based on parameters of the campaign to be fielded and the information concerning the record); and

(d) managing said record in said workflow based upon said initial station assignment (See column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein the record is managed based on the initial assignment/segment);

(e) acting upon said record in said workflow within a station parameter of said initial station (See column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein the record is acted upon based on the assigned segment and the workflow based on the assigned campaign to the segment); and

(f) prompting said record in said workflow based upon completion of the step of acting upon said record in said workflow within a station parameter wherein said promotion includes a next stage selected from the group consisting of another station and exit from workflow (See

Art Unit: 3623

column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein the workflow flows from segmentation to campaign implementation to tracking).

However, Waits et al. does not expressly disclose the record exiting the workflow.

Waits et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. specifically discusses that the record flows from segmentation to campaign implementation to tracking. It is old and well known in workflow sequencing and management that workflows have an end associated with an exit position or station. Further, it is old and well known that marketing campaigns have end timeframes associated with them. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an exit station in the workflow of Waits et al. in order to more efficiently manage the progress of the workflow by establishing all stations associated with the workflow, including an end to a workflow.

As per claim 2, Waits et al. discloses selecting a subsequent station within said workflow for said record (See figure 10, column 4, lines 30-35).

As per claim 4, Waits et al. wherein parameters for said workflow includes defining a subsequent station for a said record (See column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein the workflow flows from segmentation to campaign implementation to tracking).

As per claim 5, Waits et al. discloses wherein parameters for said workflow includes creating an action to be conducted by a user upon said record (See column 4, lines 30-50, wherein actions are conducted on the customer record based on the strategy and campaign, such as sending mailings to the customer).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 6, Waits et al. teaches compiling a report of said record (See column 5, lines 19-40 and 55-62, and column 8, lines 59-67, wherein a report is compiled concerning the outcomes of the campaign as well as on customer's transactions).

As per claim 7, Waits et al. discloses said report includes parameters selected from a plurality of fields of said record (See column 8, lines 59-67, wherein reports can be run on segments with different demographic characteristics).

As per claim 12, Waits et al. discloses creating an opportunity within said workflow for marketing a product (See column 1, lines 40-45, column 3, lines 35-45, column 5, lines 24-40, wherein a product, such as a bond for a bank, is marketed).

As per claim 13, Waits et al. teaches wherein said opportunity includes workflow parameters for the product (See column 1, lines 40-45, column 3, lines 35-45, column 5, lines 24-40, wherein a product is marketed to a specific segment of customers).

As per claims 19-20, Waits et al. teaches discloses users, such as marketers and investigators, having access to data in the database (See column 1, lines 40-47, column 3, lines 30-45, column 5, lines 15-45). However, Waits et al. does not expressly disclose removing a user from said database or reassigning said record from said user.

Waits et al. discloses a marketing and campaign management system that allows users, such as marketers, to have access to database records. It is well-known in the art that administrators via an administration system can assign and delete access rights to systems. It is further old and well known that when a user leaves a job, his tasks are redistributed to another employee or user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an administration system that assigns and deletes access rights

Art Unit: 3623

(i.e. remove a user) and then redistribute the tasks associated with that user in order to increase the integrity of the data by controlling access to said data.

Claim 23 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claims 24, 25, 26, 27, 32 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 2, 5, 6, 7, and 12, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim 38 and 39 recite substantially similar limitations to claim 19 and 20, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim 42 recites substantially similar limitations to claims 1 and 2 combined and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 43, Waits et al. teaches compiling a progress report of said record (See column 5, lines 19-40 and 55-62, and column 8, lines 59-67, wherein a report is compiled of transaction histories).

Claim 51 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 52, Waits et al. discloses a recordable data storage medium (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, line 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database).

Claim 53 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 6 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:



Art Unit: 3623

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3, 8-11, 14-16, 18, 21, 28-31, 33-35, 37, 40, 44-47, 49, and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waits et al. (U.S. 5,721,831) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 6,067,525).

As per claim 3, Waits et al. discloses a workflow associated with marketing activities and campaigns, including tasks such as mailings, segmenting, etc., as set forth above with respect to claims 1. However, Waits et al. does not expressly disclose assigning a duration for a record to remain in a station. Johnson et al. discloses assigning a duration for a record to remain in a station (See column 3, lines 60-67, column 4, lines 12-22 and 52-58, and column 5, lines 30-40, wherein parameters/features associated with the workflow are customized to make the workflow specific to the customer and the customer's record. Each phase of the workflow has specific timing associated with its functionality).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. discloses specific tasks associated with the workflow. Johnson et al. discloses specific timing associated with tasks and functions in the workflow. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include durations associated with tasks in order to more efficiently manage the tasks by assigning them specific timeframes to occur. It is old and well known in task management that tasks have associated start and end times.

As per claims 8-11, Waits et al. teaches compiling a report of said record (See column 5, lines 19-40 and 55-62, and column 8, lines 59-67, wherein a report is compiled concerning the

Art Unit: 3623

outcomes of the campaign as well as on customer's transactions). However, Waits et al. does not expressly disclose that the report is an automatically generated, setting a frequency for generating said report, selecting a medium for communicating said report selected from the group consisting of electronic mail, a print copy, and a hyperlink to a browser page.

Johnson et al. discloses wherein said report is an automatically generated (See column 13, lines 24-35, column 18, lines 1-15 and 36-45, wherein a report is automatically compiled) and setting a frequency for generating said report (See column 13, lines 24-35, column 18, lines 1-15 and 36-45, which discloses a periodic report).

Johnson et al. further discloses selecting a medium for communicating said report (See column 20, lines 10-30, wherein a medium is selected for communication) selected from the group consisting of electronic mail, a print copy, and a hyperlink to a browser page (See column 20, lines 10-30, wherein reports are at least emailed).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. discloses reporting capabilities. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the reporting features of Johnson et al. in the reporting of Waits et al. in order to more efficiently provide the marketer and the organization with details associated with the marketing workflow enacted by providing a controlled and automated reporting framework. See column 5, lines 19-40 and 55-62, and column 8, lines 59-67, of Waits et al., which discloses the importance of reporting.

As per claims 14-15, Waits et al. discloses customer records with parameters in a customer database (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, line 30-40, which disclose customer

Art Unit: 3623

records in a database). However, Waits et al. does not expressly disclose that a record is defined by an originating source and teaches said source providing a selection of originating stations in said workflow.

Johnson et al. discloses wherein each record is defined by an originating source (See column 4, lines 24-42, column 7, lines 20-25, column 10, line 60-column 11, line 30, wherein each record is defined at an originating source, such as at a trade show). Johnson et al. further teaches said source providing a selection of originating stations in said workflow (See column 4, lines 24-42, column 7, lines 20-25, column 10, line 60-column 11, line 30, wherein different originating stations exist, such as a kiosk, a purchased database, with a sales person, etc.).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. discloses customer records. Johnson et al. specifically discloses storing information in the customer record concerning from where the record originated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include originating source in the record of Waits et al. in order to more efficiently segment the users by storing more comprehensive information about the customers.

As per claim 16, Waits et al. teaches workflow parameters (See column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein stations/positions).

Johnson et al. teaches wherein parameters for said workflow includes amending a station definition (See column 5, lines 30-50, and column 21, lines 15-30, wherein the placement in the workflow is amendable/changeable).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3623

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the user to amend and customize the workflow parameters in order to increase the flexibility of the system to meet the specific needs of user.

As per claim 18, Waits et al. teaches compiling customer records (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, lines 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database). However, Waits et al. does not teach removing said record from said database. Johnson et al. teaches removing said record from said database (See column 31, lines 50-65).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. discloses customer records and using and updating these records. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to remove records from the database of Waits et al. in order to increase the integrity of the data in the database by expunging old and unused records. Expunging records is old and well known in database maintenance.

As per claim 21, Waits et al. teaches compiling customer records (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, lines 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database). However, Waits et al. does not teach the specific source of these records, such as by importing multiple records from an external source.

Johnson et al. teaches importing multiple records from an external source (See column 4, lines 24-41, column 23, lines 30-45, and column 24, lines 5-25 and 36-45, wherein records are imported from an external source, such as an external database or a purchased database).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. discloses customer records being

Art Unit: 3623

housed in a database of the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the source of the records, such as by importing records from an external source, in the system of Waits et al. in order to more allow for more efficient marketing using a marketing database by having contained therein a sufficient number of records.

As per claim 35, Waits et al. teaches workflow parameters (See column 3, lines 20-41, column 4, lines 10-35, column 5, lines 10-35, wherein stations/positions).

Johnson et al. teaches wherein said workflow parameter is amendable (See column 5, lines 30-50, and column 21, lines 15-30, wherein the workflow is amendable/changeable).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the user to amend and customize the workflow parameters in order to increase the flexibility of the system to meet the specific needs of user.

Claims 28-31, 33-34, and 37 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 8-11, 14-15, and 18, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claims 40, 44, and 45 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 21, 10, and 9, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claims 46-47 recite substantially similar limitations to claim 21 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 49, Waits et al. teaches customer records in a database (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, lines 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database). However, Waits

Art Unit: 3623

et al. does not teach and Johnson et al. teaches adding custom fields to the record (See column 20, lines 35-48, which discuss customized fields associated with said record).

Both Waits et al. and Johnson et al. disclose managing a customer record through a workflow associated with a marketing opportunity. Waits et al. discloses customer records being housed in a database of the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to customize the records in the database of Waits et al. in order to more allow for more efficient marketing using a marketing database containing specific items of data needed by the marketer.

Claims 54 and 55 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 46 and 49, respectively, are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

12. Claims 17 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waits et al. (U.S. 5,721,831) in view of Raffel et al. (U.S. 2002/0082892).

As per claim 17, Waits et al. teaches compiling customer records (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, lines 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database). However, Waits et al. does not teaches resolving a duplicate record.

Raffel et al. discloses determining if a duplicate record exists and resolving how to handle such a duplicate record (See paragraph 0095).

Waits et al. discloses maintaining customer data in a database. Resolving duplicate records is well-known in database management and is disclosed in a network-based automation tool of Raffel et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to resolve duplicate data in the databases of Waits et al. in order to more

Art Unit: 3623

accurately segment the customers by ensuring that the data of the system is up to date since no other duplicate data is used.

Claim 36 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 17 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

13. Claims 22, 41, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waits et al. (U.S. 5,721,831) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 6,067,525) and in further view of Raffel et al. (U.S. 2002/0082892).

As per claim 22, Waits et al. teaches compiling customer records (See column 1, lines 50-57, column 3, lines 30-40, which disclose customer records in a database). However, Waits et al. does not teach the specific source of these records, such as by importing multiple records from an external source.

Johnson et al. discloses importing multiple records from an external source (See column 4, lines 24-41, column 23, lines 30-45, and column 24, lines 5-25 and 36-45, wherein records are imported from an external source, such as an external database or a purchased database). However, Johnson et al. does not expressly disclose that importing includes creating a file import map within the parameters of the database.

Raffel et al. discloses a network-based sales force automation tool that includes the functionality of mapping and importing to a file (See paragraph 0068 and claims 7 and 40, which disclose mapping fields to a file).

Waits and Johnson et al. are in analogous art and are combinable for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 21.

Art Unit: 3623

Johnson et al. discloses importing multiple records from an external source to a single record in a database. Using a file import map to aide in the synchronization of the data is a well-known import technique and is disclosed in a network-based tool of Raffel et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a file import map in the system of Johnson et al. in order to allow the system to more efficiently exchange data and provide for maximum usability of the data through uniform formatting. See column 24, lines 5-15 and 30-50, of Johnson et al.

Claims 41 and 48 recite substantially similar limitations to claim 22 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

14. Claims 50 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waits et al. (U.S. 5,721,831) in view of Srinivasan (U.S. 5,548,506).

As per claim 50, Waits et al. discloses a workflow associated with marketing activities and campaigns, as set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 42. However, Waits et al. does not expressly disclose a personal reminder schedule for the user of the database (i.e. the marketer or investigator).

Srinivasan discloses task reminders being sent to a user when a task is nearing its scheduled deadline (See figure 6, column 5, lines 40-50, column 6, lines 10-15, and column 7, lines 55-61, which disclose a remind function).

Waits et al. discloses a workflow associated with marketing activities and campaigns, including tasks like segmenting and mailings. Srinivasan discloses a remind function in a task management system that sends a user a reminder to complete a task in order to complete an



Art Unit: 3623

overall project in a timely manner. Sending reminders to a user is well-known in scheduling software. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to schedule and send a reminder the user of Waits et al. in order to enhance the marketer's ability to manage multiple tasks and events at the same time.

Claim 56 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 50 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection, as necessitated by amendment.

#### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*bvd*

bvd

January 22, 2007

*Beth Van Dora*  
Patent Examiner  
AU 3623